

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed January 20, 2010 has been carefully reviewed. From the Summary page, claims 1-20 are pending. An objection was made to claims 3-8, 11, 15-16 and 19 as reciting allowable subject matter but depending upon a rejected base claim. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12-14, 17-18 and 20 are rejected. The Drawings filed June 28, 2004 remain accepted. Acknowledgment again has been made of Applicant's Claim for Priority. The Information Disclosure Statements filed November 2, 2009 and August 9, 2004 have been considered.

By this response, claims 2-8, 11-12, 14-16 and 19-20 have been amended. Specifically, claims 3-8, 11, 15-16 and 19 are now presented as independent claims. Claims 1, 9-10, 13 and 17-18 have been canceled. New claims 21-22 have been added. Claim 21 recites the features of claims 13-15. New claim 22 recites similar features as claim 20 but depends upon claim 21. No statutory new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the specification.

There are currently eleven (11) independent claims. Applicant submits the requisite fee for eight (8) independent claims in excess of the allotted three (3).

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12-14, 17, 18 and 20 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. (US 5,946,523) in view of Nagase et al. (US 5,752,133). The rejection as to claims 1, 9-10, 13 and 17-18 is moot upon cancellation. The rejection as to claims, 2, 12, 14 and 20 is traversed.

Applicant has incorporated the features of canceled claim 1 into claim 3. Since claim 3 was indicated as reciting allowable subject matter, but depending upon a rejected base claim, it now should be considered as in immediate condition for allowance. Claims 2 and 12 now depend upon claim 3. Similarly, Applicant has incorporated the features of canceled claim 13 into claim 15. Claim 15 also should be considered as in immediate condition for allowance. Claims 14 and 20 depend upon claim 15. Since each of claims 2, 12, 14 and 20 depend upon allowable claims, they are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are courteously solicited by Applicant.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the presently outstanding objection and rejection and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

If any fees under 37 C. F. R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 032739M097**.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:



Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263
1130 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: April 20, 2010

SGRDC\371110.1